

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested in view of the remarks.

Claims 3-6 and 17-19 have been objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Referring to Claims 3-6, while two triggered rules is believed to be a limitation on at least one, Claim 3 has been amended to claim "executing the at least one triggered rule", correcting an antecedent basis informality.

Referring to Claim 17-19, Claims 17 and 18 have been amended to clarify the additional limitations as being conditional on the result of Claim 16.

Reconsideration of the objections is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9 and 13-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Boyd (USPN 6,484,148). The Examiner stated essentially that Boyd teaches all the limitations of Claims 1-9 and 13-21.

Claims 1, 14, and 20 are the independent claims.

Claim 1 claims, *inter alia*, "displaying the content according to the triggered rule, wherein no content is displayed when no device parameter indicates the detection of one of the radio frequency identification tag and the infrared tag." Claim 14 claims, *inter alia*, "determining a monetary charge based on the content displayed and a value associated with the satisfied rules which triggered the display of the content, wherein different rules having different values."

Claim 20 claims, *inter alia*, “determining a value for each of the device parameters, determining at least one device parameter satisfying the triggered rule, and determining the fee according to value of the device parameters.”

Referring to Claim 1; Boyd teaches a method for display advertisements according to identifying signals corresponding to consumer profiles (see col. 5, lines 9-14). Boyd does not teach “displaying the content according to the triggered rule, wherein no content is displayed when no device parameter indicates the detection of one of the radio frequency identification tag and the infrared tag” as claimed in Claim 1. Boyd specifically teaches that “non-targeted” ads are displayed when no identifying signal is received and/or when no consumer profile is available (see col. 10, lines 11-14). Thus, Boyd does not teach that no content is displayed in the where no tag is detected, teach that the detection of a radio frequency identification tag or infrared tag satisfies a rule for the display of content. Therefore, Boyd fails to teach all the limitations of Claim 1.

Referring to Claim 14; Boyd teaches a method for display advertisements according to identifying signals corresponding to consumer profiles (see col. 5, lines 9-14). Boyd does not teach “determining a monetary charge based on the content displayed and a value associated with the satisfied rules which triggered the display of the content, wherein different rules having different values” as claimed in Claim 14. Boyd teaches that company subscribers pay to have their ads delivered to a targeted consumer (see col. 11, lines 52-56). Thus, Boyd pays the company subscribers according to a number of ads delivered. The number of ads delivered is not believed to be analogous to determining a monetary charge based on the content displayed and a value of the satisfied rules which triggered the display of the content. For example, Boyd pays

based only a number of ads displayed. Therefore, Boyd fails to teach all the limitations of Claim 14.

Referring to Claim 20; Boyd teaches a method for display advertisements according to identifying signals corresponding to consumer profiles (see col. 5, lines 9-14). Boyd does not teach “determining a value for each of the device parameters, determining at least one device parameter satisfying the triggered rule, and determining the fee according to value of the device parameters” as claimed in Claim 20. Boyd teaches that company subscribers pay to have their ads delivered to a targeted consumer (see col. 11, lines 52-56). Boyd fails to teach that rules have values, much less that company subscribers are paid a fee according to the value of a triggered rule. Therefore, Boyd fails to teach all the limitations of Claim 20.

Claims 2-9 depend from Claim 1. Claims 15-19 depend from Claim 14. Claim 21 depends from Claim 20. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claims 1, 14, and 21. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 10-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boyd. The Examiner stated essentially that Boyd teaches or suggests all the limitations of Claims 10 and 11.

Claims 10-12 depend from Claim 1. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for Claim 1. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the forgoing reasons, the application, including Claims 1-20, is believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the case is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 23, 2007

/Nathaniel T. Wallace/
Nathaniel T. Wallace
Reg. No. 48,909
Attorney for Applicants

Mailing Address:
F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
TEL: (516) 692-8888
FAX: (516) 692-8889